



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

EDUCATIONAL NEWS AND EDITORIAL COMMENT

MEETING OF THE DEPARTMENT OF SUPERINTENDENCE, RICHMOND,
VIRGINIA, FEBRUARY 23-28, 1914

The officers are: President, Ben Blewett, superintendent of instruction, public schools, St. Louis, Mo.; Vice-Presidents, W. E. Ranger, state commissioner of schools, Providence, R.I., and A. S. Cook, superintendent of Baltimore County schools, Towson, Md.; Secretary, Anna E. Logan, Ohio State Normal School, Oxford, Ohio.

President Blewett has prepared the following tentative program:

Tuesday evening—

Address of Welcome

Response

"Sociological Questions in School Co-operation," Edward T. Devine, sociologist, New York City. Paper to be supplied.

Wednesday morning—

"Distinctions between Vocational and Cultural Education," David Snedden, commissioner of education for Massachusetts, Boston, Mass., and William C. Bagley, professor of education, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Wednesday afternoon—

"Part Time, Continuation, Shop, and Trade Schools," R. J. Condon, superintendent of schools, Cincinnati, Ohio; H. P. Hughes, superintendent of schools, McComb, Miss.; F. W. Thomas, supervisor of apprentices, A.T. & S.F. Ry., Topeka, Kan.; Lewis Gustafson, superintendent of Ranken School of Trades, St. Louis, Mo.

Wednesday evening—

"Condition of Rural Schools," presented by U.S. Bureau of Education.

"Hopeful Experiments" (20 min. papers), Mabel Carney, Normal, Ill.; Josephine C. Preston, state superintendent of public instruction, Olympia, Wash.; Susie V. Powell, Jackson, Miss.; Cora Wilson Stewart, Moorhead, Ky.

Thursday morning—

"The Foundation of Educational Achievement," Edward L. Thorndike, professor of educational psychology, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York.

"Report of Committee on Economy of Time in Education," H. B. Wilson, superintendent of city schools, Topeka, Kan.; J. F. Hosis, head of English Department, Chicago Normal College, Chicago, Ill.; W. A. Jessup, director, School of Education, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.

Thursday afternoon—

ROUND TABLES

"State and County Superintendents," Chairman, Augustus L. Downing, first assistant commissioner of education, Albany, N.Y.

Cities over 300,000 Population, Martin G. Brumbaugh, superintendent of schools, Philadelphia, Pa.

Cities 25,000 to 300,000, Ernest O. Holland, superintendent of schools, Louisville, Ky.

Cities under 25,000, Eli E. Bass, superintendent of city schools, Greenville, Miss.

Thursday evening—

"Determinants of the Course of Study," A. Duncan Yocum, professor of educational research and practice, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.; John W. Withers, president, Harris Teachers College, St. Louis, Mo.

Friday morning—

"Rural Schools in New York," John H. Finley, commissioner of education, Albany, N.Y.

"Rural-School Administration," a collaborated paper by Ellwood P. Cubberley, professor of education, Leland Stanford Junior University, Stanford University, Cal., and Edward C. Elliott, director, course for the training of teachers, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

The officers of the National Council are: President, Robert J. Aley, president of the University of Maine, Orono, Me.; Vice-President, James Y. Joyner, state superintendent of public instruction, Raleigh, N.C.; Secretary, W. B. Owen, principal, Chicago Normal School, Chicago, Ill.

President Aley proposes to hold a session of the National Council on Monday evening, February 23, at which reports will be received from various members on the subject of "Health Problems of the American Public School." The Tuesday morning session will be devoted to the work of the committee on "Standards and Tests of Efficiency." The Tuesday afternoon program has not yet been formulated.

Outlines of the programs of the Normal School and School Administration Departments have not yet been received.

OTHER EDUCATIONAL MEETINGS

In addition to the above the following organizations will hold meetings during the week at times when they will least interfere with the programs announced above:

National Society for the Study of Education.
Society of College Teachers of Education.
National Committee on Agricultural Education.
Educational Press Association of America.
National Council of Teachers of English.
Conferences of State Superintendents of Education and of Teachers of Education in State Universities with Commissioner Claxton.
Conference of Teachers in City Training Schools.
American School Peace League.
International Kindergarten Union.
National Congress of Mothers and Parent-Teacher Associations.
School Garden Association of America.
National Association of Collegiate Registrars.
National Council of Education and the Departments of Normal Schools.
School Administration of the National Education Association.

The official headquarters will be at the Hotel Jefferson, and the hotels Murphy and Richmond will be utilized for headquarters for commercial exhibits. Most of the meetings will be held in either the city auditorium, high school, or the Hotel Jefferson.

There is much in the neighborhood of Richmond having historical significance. A project is now on foot to run a special train to Hampton where the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, the Alma Mater of Booker T. Washington, one of the largest schools for Negroes in the United States can be visited. The Institute offers to serve a dinner to the visitors if arrangements can be made for such a trip, the cost of which will be from \$1.50 to \$2.50, depending upon the number in the party. Hampton is located on Hampton Roads, the scene of the famous fight between the "Merrimac" and "Monitor," and is only a few miles from Fortress Monroe at Old Point Comfort. The details will be worked out before the Bulletin is issued containing a program of the meeting.

The question of railroad rates is in a fair process of settlement. The Southeastern Passenger Association, in whose territory Richmond is situated, has granted an open round-trip rate at practically $1\frac{1}{2}$ cents a mile. They have made a tender to the adjacent passenger associations, and we are hopeful that a solution will be reached under which a repetition of the trouble at Philadelphia will be impossible.

THE SCHOOL SITUATION IN CHICAGO

John D. Shoop, formerly assistant superintendent of schools in Chicago, was elected to succeed Ella Flagg Young by the vote of the

Board of Education, December 10, 1913. It is asserted that the opposition to Mrs. Young is the result of a long-continued political cabal and that many months ago a campaign had been begun to unseat her. Late last spring the ill-feeling came to a head. It took the form of an action on the part of the board to ignore a recommendation made by Mrs. Young concerning a spelling-book. The superintendent asserted at that time that certain textbook agents attempted to bully her, and raised the old cry of textbook graft. Finally, in July, came Mrs. Young's resignation. This was followed by a great number of petitions, chiefly from organizations of women, addressed to Mayor Harrison and demanding that the resignation be refused. Mr. Harrison brought pressure to bear upon the board, the resignation was not accepted, Mrs. Young reconsidered, and again entered upon her duties.

The present action seems to have been entirely unexpected by the public. At the board meeting of December 10 the question of the election of a superintendent came up in the regular order of business; two names, Mrs. Young's and Mr. Shoop's, were put in nomination. Against vigorous protest the majority of the board insisted on the legal right of a secret ballot. The vote as taken showed ten votes for Mrs. Young and six for Mr. Shoop, with four members not voting. Mrs. Young immediately withdrew her name, saying that the superintendent who needs more than one ballot to elect her would not have the necessary support. After this withdrawal the board proceeded to elect Mr. Shoop.

At this action Mayor Harrison professes to be very indignant. The board members are all his appointees. He has written five of the men who opposed Mrs. Young that he accepts their resignations. It appears that before Mr. Harrison appointed these men he obtained from each of them a written resignation; these resignations he now proposes to accept. However, the five men decline to be thus ousted from the board, and propose to fight on the ground that their letters of resignation, placed in the hands of the mayor before the appointments were actually made, are illegal. The men argue that it is impossible to resign a position before one actually holds it; that in reality the mayor has not the power of removal; and that the removing power is entirely in the hands of the state.

In the meantime Mrs. Young has accepted another position, and Mr. Shoop has entered upon the duties of superintendent. On December 12, the *Chicago Tribune* announced that Mrs. Young had agreed to become "educational editor"; on December 14, her salutatory address to the

public appeared. Mr. Shoop has thus far paid no attention to vigorous expressions from the mayor, nor to strong resolutions calling on him to resign. These resolutions were passed by a tumultuous mass meeting held December 13 in the Auditorium Theater. The will of this gathering of women's organizations expressed itself in two other resolutions: one calling on the mayor to insist upon the re-election of Mrs. Young; the other calling on Governor Dunne to summon an extra meeting of the legislature to do two things: first, to make the school board elective instead of appointive; and second, to make a "recall" possible for recreant members of the board who "may prove traitors to public sentiment."

While the sentiment of the public so far expressed seems to favor Mrs. Young, it is significant that the Chicago Principals' Club, the majority of which are men, passed the following resolution:

"WHEREAS Mr. John D. Shoop has been elected superintendent of Chicago public schools,

"Be it resolved, That we, the members of the Chicago Principals' Club, extend to him our loyal support; that we express confidence in him as a man and as an educator, and that we pledge ourselves to support him in his administration of the public schools."

This resolution was, to be sure, passed by a divided vote.

This is the status as the *Review* goes to press (December 15). The schools of Chicago are in the midst of an unseemly wrangle. The animus of the contending parties, their personality, and their individual interest are of exceedingly minor importance. What is of supreme importance is that there may come, as soon as possible, to the superior school system and to the excellent teaching force of the schools of Chicago, peace. If to secure peace, to eliminate personal bickerings and jealousies, it becomes necessary to remove one or two or twenty individuals, this ought to be done. Harmony under sane leadership is the pressing need.

LAY vs. EXPERT CONTROL

New York City still discusses the never-solved, and under present conditions unsolvable, problem of the division of functions between the lay school board and professional workers. Schoolmen maintain that the board, as representative of the general public, should determine principles of general policy by way of making clear the public demands; that it should embody such policy in the form of general legislation; that it should choose men capable of carrying out in detail the work it outlines in general terms; that it should vote the material means of carrying on

the work, but leave the expenditure to those who are responsible for the work; that it should have power of veto as to policies proposed by the superintendent not covered by its general statements of policy; and, finally, that it should hold its expert agents responsible for securing the results aimed at by its general legislation. Beyond this, in the opinion of the schoolman, the board has no power to go; and therefore no right to attempt more. The problems relating to the adjustment of educational details are too complicated for untrained hands. They require a wealth of technical information and a skilled professional judgment that the layman cannot hope to have. Each detail of the courses of study, of the methods of work, of grading and promotion of children, of equipment, supplies, and textbooks, of the qualifications of teachers, can be understood, and the necessary adjustments made, only in the light of this large body of technical information which the layman cannot possess. After telling the expert what he wants done and giving him the supplies necessary, the layman will have to leave it to the expert to secure in his own way the results that are demanded; reserving the right to dismiss him from the service if he does not secure the results demanded, and to employ somebody who can and will do so.

On the other hand, the layman is quite skeptical as to even the existence of educational experts. Really in his heart he looks upon those who claim expertness as but pseudo-experts. The protagonists of the school board view in New York City claim that for the eleven years since the passage of the 1902 charter the experts have had full sway, and that the results have been the large inefficiency shown by the reports of the recent investigation. They assert that not only must the board determine matters of general policy and supply funds, but also that it must exert itself actively in school affairs relating to courses of study, textbooks, teachers' qualifications, and all the rest, in order to enforce efficiency on the part of the so-called experts. It must initiate details because of the inertia of professional officials in doing so. It must "interfere" in professional matters, since this is necessary for enforcing professional efficiency. As the representative of the people, it has been made responsible for securing efficiency in every aspect of the school work.

Now, as a matter of fact, this New York school board has never understood the nature of its larger functions, nor has it ever attempted to perform them, much less perform them efficiently. No school board in the United States has ever attempted to define general policy in sufficiently exact and definite terms to show to the experts of the school

system just what it wanted done. Vagueness and inefficiency in expressing what the public wants and needs have been the rule, that has as yet no exception in the country. An expert contractor, being told to build a house, but without being given any architect's plan to show the results which he must aim at securing, is not likely to construct a satisfactory building. Neither will a school superintendent without some such definite statement of what is wanted. The school board has a sufficiently large task on its hands yet unperformed. If it will do this, it perhaps can then enforce effectiveness on the part of its expert agents, just as a builder can enforce satisfactory work on the part of his agent contractor without continually interfering in the details of the work.

J. F. B.

FACULTY ADVISERS

The *Champaign* (Illinois) *News* announces that the students of the high school are assigned in groups to the special care of faculty members; each of the women teachers is the adviser for about thirty girls, and each of the men, mentor for the same number of boys. This step, in line with the movement begun in a few other cities, has been taken because the administrative officers are unable to keep in close personal touch with all of the pupils in a school of 500.

That the great majority of school children, high-school pupils, college and university students are in constant need of sensible advice cannot be doubted. To realize this need one has only to reflect what an inadequate perspective average young men and young women have. They do not look far into the future. They do not see how important are the years of youth for the years of maturity. They do not realize that scope of the labor they will be able to perform in the productive period of their lives is largely determined by the use they make of the preparatory period. Moreover, when a youth does have ambitions, they are too often mere daydreams based on some snap judgment. And then, the average youth has no means of estimating his own capabilities; he may think that he has the native tastes and capacity for a certain profession, when in reality he is totally unsuited for the special object of his ambitions.

What are the various parts of our educational system doing to meet this need? Unfortunately, very little. In the great majority of homes the attitude is, "We keep the children in the schools as long as we can; let them find out there what they are good for." Few parents deliberately study their children to determine where their best possibilities lie.

Now it is quite possible that in the elementary school there is really no need of advice. There are certain necessary fundamentals which it is the duty of the elementary schools to teach. In the high-school period, however, we find that the variety of training offered is a matter for serious consideration. Here are a Latin school and a manual-training school side by side. Under the same roof perhaps there are various and varying courses leading in widely differing directions. Teachers feel the need of giving sound advice at this point in a pupil's career, but have no real means of making a sure judgment. At best it is guesswork.

Follow into college the selected group which leaves the secondary schools. One might naturally suppose that during the first year or two in college some systematic and scientific effort would be made to determine what a boy's talents fit him for. But no, we are too busy with the routine of our classwork really to study the individual merits of the students. The result is that one can see in every university students in the law school who ought never to think of practicing law. We see dropped out of the engineering school boys who have to all intents wasted one year in finding out that they cannot hope to be engineers. Indeed it is the general rule, not the exception, that a student may go through ten years of schooling from the beginning of his high-school course to the end of his university career and never receive one thorough, scientific investigation of his real powers. Our educational system is based on the principle, Let the student attempt anything that he pleases. It is little more than a trial and error process.

It is to reduce to a minimum the errors of undirected school activities that the faculty adviser system is designed. The purpose is indeed commendable. The difficulty is that very few advisers are capable of giving counsel on vitally important matters. The faculty mentor may perhaps keep track of the pupil's grades and deportment; he may give some more or less useful advice as to what courses to elect; he may even talk about matters of a more intimate and personal nature. These are all worth while; and in themselves justify the admirable plan now being tried by the Champaign high school, by all private schools, and by most colleges. The fact remains, however, that as yet we have no real standards by which even the skilled adviser can render the most important advice of all. We have indeed certain tests by which a reasonably accurate judgment of a degree of feeble-mindedness may be determined. We are constantly making experiments to measure all sorts of educational problems. But we can number on one hand the trained

psychologists and students of pedagogy who are attempting to standardize tests by which fitness for the various life activities can be estimated, or who are tabulating those qualifications that will furnish a reasonable hope of success in medicine, in law, in teaching, or in any other profession. That educators are beginning to realize this need is indicated by the fact that former President Benton of Miami, now of the University of Vermont, planned to have a Dean to give his entire time to the scientific study of individual students. It is, moreover, a hopeful sign that one of the topics to be discussed in the next meeting of the American Psychological Association is "The Tests of College Freshmen," as projected by Reed College and by a few other institutions.

Because the problem referred to is vague, hard to limit, intangible, does not make it any the less necessary for an educational system that purports to be scientific. Let the colleges and the secondary schools, as soon as possible, fill the most important chairs of all, chairs to be occupied by *deans of men and of women*, deans whose business it is, not to keep track of the minutiae of grades and of conduct, mere clerical duties for the most part, but deans whose business it is to be able to give, after thorough and scientific investigation in every individual case, sound advice in regard to a student's potentialities. Such men and women will be worthy of the name "faculty advisers."

STUDENT GOVERNMENT IN THE HIGH SCHOOL

In the Detroit Central High School and the Lake View High School in Chicago there are established two widely differing kinds of student self-government. Detroit Central, under the guidance of Principal David MacKenzie, has established a Student Court with elaborate court procedure. Twelve judges from the eleventh and twelfth grades are elected by popular vote of the student body. The court issues summons to any student upon its own motion, upon the request of the principal, or upon the request of any three students. The accused pleads, is tried by a jury, and is acquitted or convicted by a majority of three-fourths. Penalties are prescribed and inflicted by the presiding judge. The Lake View plan, inspired by Principal B. Frank Brown, establishes a commission of five members, each of whom presides over a large committee. The president of the commission is in charge of a committee on "morals, dress, courtesy, school spirit, and honesty." Under his chairmanship are thirty deputies, one in each room of the school. The four other committees, each presided over by a commissioner, are on

“attendance,” on “school improvements,” on “health,” and on “safety.” The plan of the commission is merely to counsel with offenders and to bring upon them the force of a united school sentiment, as expressed by the commission and ratified by the student body.

These two plans differ in several respects. One proposes to punish; the other to prevent. One establishes an elaborate system of procedure which seems likely to break down in the hands of immature officers; the other establishes a system of supervision that involves no great administrative difficulties. The Detroit Central plan appears at least to remove discipline from the hands of the school authorities; the Lake View plan, while allowing the students to establish for themselves general rules of conduct, and allowing them in case of necessity to pass judgment and even suggest penalties, leaves the disciplining power in the hands of the principal.

Any wise plan of self-government needs to be based upon at least three principles; first, the unanimous support of the student body; second, a careful limitation of jurisdiction to matters that may safely be left to the decision of immature minds; and, third, back of the student officers there needs always to be the full strength of school officials in the matter of enforcement. While student officers may establish rules of conduct, may try offenders, and suggest suitable penalties, the enforcing or punishing power ought to remain in the hands of the high-school principal. This last provision seems necessary both to insure the discipline of the school and to relieve the student officers of responsibilities they ought not to be called upon to assume.

THE USE OF A SCORE CARD IN APPRAISING CLASS WORK

We print below part of a “classroom inspection card” used by the Ohio School Survey Commission. Samples of fifteen other cards used by the commission may be obtained from Dr. H. L. Brittain, director, Columbus, Ohio. The score-card method of measuring has many advantages when the object to be judged presents factors that can be estimated in definite units. A score-card method may be satisfactory to estimate the physical excellence of a schoolroom, for air and light and heat facilities may be stated in recognized units. A score-card method is also satisfactory for a horse fair. Certain of the most important qualifications of a good animal may be estimated in pounds and inches. Yet even the expert in horses finds that there are some qualifications that have to be estimated roughly. On such points the score

| SCHOOL | GRADE | H. S. YEAR | TEACHER | DATE |
|---|-------|---------------|---------|----------|
| I—PERSONALITY OF TEACHER (Check V) | | Illustrations | | |
| 1 Teacher appears to be | | | | |
| vigorous..... weak..... | | | | |
| poised..... nervous..... | | | | |
| neat..... slovenly..... | | | | |
| at ease..... embarrassed..... | | | | |
| 2 Voice is (Check V) | | | | |
| pleasing..... harsh..... | | | | |
| clear..... indistinct..... | | | | |
| low..... high..... | | | | |
| 3 In her personal relations with pupils does she appear (Check V) | | | | |
| to stimulate..... to suppress..... | | | | |
| to win cordial..... | | | | |
| cooperation..... to antagonize..... | | | | |
| to be sympathetic..... harsh..... | | | | |
| strict..... lax..... | | | | |
| even tempered..... irritable..... | | | | |
| reasonable..... unreasonable..... | | | | |
| tolerant..... intolerant..... | | | | |
| dignified..... undignified..... | | | | |
| Illustrations | | | | |
| II—THE RECITATION | | | | |
| 1 No. of pupils in class appearing to be interested..... | | Illustrations | | |
| energetic..... lazy..... | | | | |
| independent..... dependent..... | | | | |
| 2 Responses of pupils: No. giving | | | | |
| (a) fluent topical recitations..... | | | | |
| (b) word or phrase responses..... | | | | |
| (c) sentence responses..... | | | | |
| (d) incoherent responses..... | | | | |
| (e) failing to answer..... | | | | |
| 3 No. of pupils in section | | | | |
| not reciting..... reciting once..... twice..... | | | | |
| three times..... more than three times..... | | | | |
| 4 No. pupils in room but not in reciting section | | | | |
| No. industrious..... indolent..... | | | | |
| minding their own business..... | | | | |
| interfering with others..... | | | | |
| 5 No. of pupils asking | | | | |
| pertinent questions of fact..... | | | | |
| relevant thought-provoking questions..... | | | | |
| 6 Time lost (Check V under yes and no) | | | | |
| (a) Calling class..... | | Yes | No | No. Min. |
| (b) Dismissing class..... | | | | |
| (c) Distributing materials..... | | | | |
| (d) Indistinct speech of teacher..... | | | | |
| (e) Indistinct speech of pupils..... | | | | |
| (f) Unnecessary talking of teacher..... | | | | |
| (g) Unnecessary talking of pupils..... | | | | |
| (h) Failure to have devices ready..... | | | | |
| (i) Use of ill-adapted devices..... | | | | |

| | | (Check ✓) | | | | Evidence and Remarks |
|--|---|------------|--------|--------|---------|----------------------|
| | | Not at all | Slight | Medium | Notable | |
| 1-7 Teaching Ability as shown by | | | | | | |
| a Extent to which teacher's questions are | | | | | | |
| (1) | thought-provoking | | | | | |
| (2) | calling for facts | | | | | |
| (3) | suggesting the answer | | | | | |
| (4) | answered by "yes" or "no" | | | | | |
| (5) | irrelevant | | | | | |
| b Extent to which material to recitation is | | | | | | |
| (1) | confined to text | | | | | |
| (2) | within pupil's comprehension | | | | | |
| (3) | related to children's lives and experiences | | | | | |
| (4) | adapted to children's present or future needs | | | | | |
| (5) | worth while | | | | | |
| c Extent to which the teaching | | | | | | |
| (1) | is rambling | | | | | |
| (2) | is formal, mechanical | | | | | |
| (3) | stimulates initiative of pupils | | | | | |
| (4) | represents independent thinking | | | | | |
| (5) | develops pupil's resourcefulness | | | | | |
| (6) | requires cooperation of pupils | | | | | |
| (7) | is fixed on essentials | | | | | |
| (8) | enables pupils to organize material | | | | | |
| (9) | utilizes children's experience | | | | | |
| (10) | clears up pupils' difficulties | | | | | |
| (11) | shows use of material in connection with present or future problems | | | | | |

| | | (Check ✓) | | | | Evidence and Remarks |
|---|--|-----------|-------|-------|-------|----------------------|
| | | I | S | M | N | |
| Teaching Ability | | | | | | |
| d | Extent to which pupils had a clear idea of purposes of lesson | | | | | |
| (2) | were self-reliant | | | | | |
| (3) | tested their own solutions | | | | | |
| (4) | acted and thought on their own account | | | | | |
| (5) | cooperated with teacher and classmates | | | | | |
| (6) | persisted in getting desired result | | | | | |
| (7) | differentiated between essentials and non-essentials | | | | | |
| (8) | organized their material | | | | | |
| (9) | seemed well-grounded in previous work | | | | | |
| 8 Was the Assignment | | | | | | |
| a. | definite and clear? | | | | | |
| b. | related to present lesson? | | | | | |
| c. | such that the pupils were prepared to attack it intelligently? | | | | | |
| d. | formal—from text book? | | | | | |
| e. | by topics or problems? | | | | | |
| f. | hastily made at dismissal? | | | | | |
| g. | omitted? | | | | | |
| 9 Correction of Essential Errors | | | | | | |
| (1) | Describe method used | | | | | |
| (2) | Are non-essential errors too much emphasized? | | | | | |
| (3) | What record is kept of recurring errors likely to retard progress of pupils? | | | | | |

card is valuable to him only as a means of classifying his judgments; the classification may possibly make the judgments somewhat easier. In like manner, when a school inspector attempts to estimate the value of a teacher's work by a score card, he finds his chief help in the rough suggestions which classify the various judgments. Consider, for example, item 3, Personal Relations with Pupils. Seventeen tests are suggested to the inspector. With the sheet of classified judgments before him, he may be better able to form a fair appraisal of a teacher's class work.

Certain obvious difficulties and objections to the actual use of the card may be cited. First, the personal attributes of a teacher are far more difficult to estimate than are the various paces of a trotting horse; second, there are too many judgments suggested on a card for one or even for several visits; third, the card if rigidly followed fails to allow for some rare excellence that overbalances many shortcomings; fourth, if used in sight of the teacher, the card may be a great factor in making her self-conscious.

Most of these shortcomings can be avoided, however, and many good results may be obtained, by a wise use of the card. This wiser method the New York Bureau of Municipal Research evidently had in mind when they added at the top of the card these suggestive headings: *To Help Teachers Discover Their Own Strength and Weakness* and *To Help Supervisors Help Teachers Where Need Is Greatest*. In other words, put these cards into the hands of the teachers of a whole state, let them know that the qualifications of good teaching are summed up in convenient form for their study, and urge them to make estimates of their own success and failure. Do this and the great number of teachers will become more intelligent critics of their own work. It may readily be pointed out, also, that inspectors often go through their work in a perfunctory way, falling into the habit of looking for only a few excellences or defects. This card then in the hand of an inspector may be a decided check on his own peculiarities of judgment. Finally, it may not be out of place to suggest that the wisest use of the card might be made if the inspector and the teacher sit down together, place the card in front of them, and consider the various items, one at a time. Thus might be avoided one of the great causes of failure in ordinary inspection; namely, that the teacher herself receives little direct first-hand benefit from the inspector's judgments.